

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

EMIL HOHMANN,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:15-CV-1200
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Chief Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
OFFICER MILLER,	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31st day of July, 2015, upon consideration of *pro se* plaintiff's revised petition (Doc. 10) for writ of mandamus, wherein plaintiff, for a second time, asks the court to remand the above-captioned action to the "Court of Record" or the "Common Law Court of Record" from which it was removed on June 18, 2015, and further upon consideration of the court's order (Doc. 9) dated July 10, 2015, wherein the court construed plaintiff's first request (Doc. 8) for mandamus as a motion to remand the above-captioned action to state court and denied same, and the court concluding that plaintiff's instant petition (Doc. 10) is appropriately construed as a motion for reconsideration of its prior order (Doc. 9) denying remand, see L.R. 7.10 (authorizing motions for reconsideration of court orders), and further concluding that plaintiff fails to state a valid basis for reconsideration, see Max's Seafood Café v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677-78 (3d Cir. 1999); Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985), and that plaintiff provides no new support for his position that the court must remand the above-captioned matter, see PAS v. Travelers Ins. Co., 7 F.3d 349, 350-52 (3d Cir. 1993) (providing that cases are generally subject to remand only "for (1) lack of district court subject matter jurisdiction or (2) a defect

in the removal procedure”), it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff’s revised petition (Doc. 10) for writ of mandamus is CONSTRUED as a motion for reconsideration of the court’s order (Doc. 9) dated July 10, 2015, and is DENIED as so construed.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER

Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania